

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

March 21, 2000 LB 1124, 1217

the public until we have addressed and solved the property tax reduction issue, and perhaps this study in LB 1124 will lead to that. I hope it will. But we're not going to solve it this session so I think it would be a difficult and disappointing proposition to go to the people and say, well, we didn't do anything for property tax except raise them by taking away the support for community colleges, and I think we have a real problem with public perception there and I think that, while this matter should be considered, that Senator Raikes' amendment is not really the way to go at this time. So I would oppose his proposed amendment.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Matzke. Any further discussion on the Raikes amendment? Seeing none, Senator Raikes, you're recognized to close on your amendment.

SENATOR RAIKES: Thank you, Madam President and members. Again, we focused a lot on community colleges and I would remind you that we're talking about \$30 million here, which is a lot of money, and we're talking about a one-time use of that money. Now I've heard some people say that the adoption of this money would cause us to abandon property tax relief. Not at all. It would cause us to resume the program we adopted a year ago. We would have...we had \$30 million last year, we would have \$35 million this year, and there would be \$35 million available, as planned, for TEEOSA next year. So we are, rather than abandoning the program, sticking to it. Now look at the second sheet, if you will, of your agenda concerning the Cash Reserve and what is an appropriate amount of money. You see in the far right, Fiscal Year 2001-2002 and also the following year, an \$80 million Cash Reserve number. Look up and look at the deficit we now have with Select File bills available--\$55 million. That leaves very little room. Now I'm not suggesting that fiscal prudence requires only that we increase the Cash Reserve. I think that's part of it. The other part of it is that we need to be restrictive on spending. But the two together I think are the course we need to take and the idea to adopt an additional \$30 million over what was planned last year at this point seems to me out of place. I don't think that's a prudent policy and I don't think we should do that and that's why I have offered this amendment. Vote as you see fit. I hope that you will see fit to support it. Thank